

November 23, 2009

Greetings Eric,

It's good to hear from you again, it has been some time since our last communication, and I hope all is well with you and yours.

Many thanks for your kind words for the "Fugio Files". I had only recently decided to see if anyone was interested in publishing the current "files". I had decided to contact Harry Salyards first, even though due to the nature of the material, Sydney Martin at C-4, seemed to be more logical. Harry had been kind enough to publish the "Fugio Files" earlier (as I'm sure you know), and because of this I wanted him to have first call on the material

Quite some time ago (1997) I was in contact with Philip Mossman and was going to have the then current "files" published through the colonial newsletter. I subsequently backed away from the project, feeling this wasn't the proper way go , as the material was too transatory, and illustrations of die varieties and die states would have to be imported from other collections. I at the time, did not have in my collection enough die states to illustrate the files properly. With the advent of photoshop, and additions to the collection, I could now illustrate the files myself and the "files" evolved into their present form.

I've quite enjoyed your recent UNITED STATES FUGIO COPPER COINAGE, it is certainly filled nose to toes with beautiful fugios. I never tire of leafing through the pages. Imagine my great surprise when I saw my name included in your Author's Gratitude section. Many, many thanks for that.

After reading your book several times, I decided I would change the words in the "files" from cent to copper, where appropriate and did so. After continuing to study your book over many months, I returned to cent rather than copper in the "files". My decision for this was based mostly on a paragraph in the book that I continue to study: "Through the May 21, 1788 discussion of coppers"... I interpret this paragraph as acknowledging the fact the the federal (fugio) cent has been struck and a portion delivered and that the contractual weight (157.5 grains) is now to low to support the cent denonmination, now it is a copper. So to my thinking it would be correct to refer the fugio as either a cent or as a copper. The fugio started out as an authorized issue at a statutory weight , filling the niche of federal cent and ended as a copper. Am I looking at this wrong? And I can't bring myself to call the nation's first authorized and issued coinage, a copper.

For your information I also collect rare weights. Specifically Nuremberg nested cup weights I have collections of English wool-weights, roman steelyards, French poid-de-ville, among others and I am a member of Isasc.

It's good to be back in touch, my email is: msmronin@hotmail.com

Michael



MSM

7372 ROXBURY AVE

MANASSAS, VA

20109

ERIC NEWMAN

6450 CECIL AVE

ST. LOUIS, MO 63105

Subj: (no subject)
Date: 12/12/2009 5:06:47 P.M. Central Standard Time
From: [EricNumis](#)
To: MSMRONIN@hotmail.com

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY
6450 Cecil Ave., St. Louis MO 63105

Mr. Michael S. McLaughlin
7372 Roxbury Ave.
Manassas VA 20109

12 12 2009

Dear Michael:

I have been on a vacation to celebrate an important wedding anniversary for my wife and self and thus did not have the opportunity to answer your November 23, 2009 letter.

I sincerely thank you for the full printed and illustrated text of the revised FUGIO FILES and the disc of it. They will go to a prominent position in our library.

I am glad that you wrote me some of the background of the history of your research on the subject.

As to your problem as to whether to name the FUGIO 1787 coinage as a cent or a copper I feel that the prior usage of "cent" by others as well as myself is a normal error which I have recently tried to correct.

Your point that 1787 Fugios were intended to be cents is sound but coppers in general circulation then were so low and fluctuating in value that the word cent could not be applied to Fugios. The United States provision for the denominations and weights of its coins was about a year old when Fugio minting negotiations became active. Vermont, Connecticut and New Jersey had already issued coppers without any mention of "cents" because they were intended to substitute for British counterfeit halfpence and were well below the U.S. provision both before it was passed and after it was passed. Massachusetts in 1787 and 1788 minted copper coinage complying with the U.S. standard and therefore properly put the cent or half cent denomination legends respectively on its coinage. Nowhere in the FUGIO negotiation or issuance period have I ever seen the word CENT used for Fugios and the word Cent was introduced for Fugios by collectors and auctioneers at a later period.

Perhaps one might wish to call them the First Authorized U. S. Coin.

I respect your opinion but I feel that what was originally intended to be done was not accomplished but something else was.

Incidentally I want to make an insignificant comment that in your "Greetings" page my first Fugio article was in 1949 and was revised and republished in the 1952 issue of the same Wayte Raymond pamphlet.

I have been a member of ISASC for ages but only involve in matters relating to coins.

My best holiday greetings to you. Eric.